



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

mentously effective, but it is slow and the lesson is often long delayed. Society does not wait for the slow sequences of natural processes. Parents and moral guardians anticipate results and, drawing from the experience of the race, they apply artificial restraints and constraints and so save the learner many bitter lessons. But no wise guardian supposes that the work of moralizing can be carried very far by methods of force and constraint. Higher agencies must come into operation before the goal is reached. Remarkable results have already been attained in all educational work by the substitution of the moral and psychological appeal for the use of force, and still more impressive is the transformation that has been wrought in penal institutions by the introduction of higher agencies in the place of force, for correcting, reforming, and redeeming those who have gone seriously astray. The world has only begun to realize the immense effectiveness of love and consecration, even with the criminal class, and great results will follow the enlarged and improved application of them.

So, too, it must be admitted that some of the civilizing work of the world has been done in the earlier stages by methods of conflict and warfare. Fighting is, no doubt, a primitive instinct, and instinct can be trusted to steer beings until there is more adequate light to steer by. There have been wars which left men farther on at the end than at the beginning, though it would be difficult to prove that it was the military methods or the successful homicide that secured the advance. Certain desirable qualities have, no doubt, been stimulated by war at its best, though even here it was the moral issue, the appeal of the ideal, rather than the killing that called forth the heroic virtues and the admirable traits.

But even if we could grant all that can be claimed of fruitful result from this ancient method of instinct, what a price is paid for it! Charles Lamb has told in his humorous essay how the men in China got their roast pig. Through an accidental fire a Chinese chanced to discover how very good to eat was the pig which the fire had caught in its flames and roasted to a crisp. Knowing no other method, he and the other Chinese, who had learned the taste, proceeded to burn down their houses whenever they wanted roast pig.

FOLLY OF WAR

The method of war is a similar kind of economy. It burns down the house and the town, lays waste the land, mortgages the resources of the future, kills its finest physical specimens of the nation, tears with its merciless plowshares through the homes and hearts of the combatants on both sides in order to get results which could always be better secured by Christian methods, even though they are slow, as are all rational, moral and educative methods. Other agencies, higher methods, are now available. The old way is antiquated and outdated and morally condemned. Truth and righteousness have now found other defenses than the egis of the strong arm. They are no longer at the mercy of the blind instinct. While instinct was in full operation, and before reflection and conscience arose, there was naturally no sense of condemnation. The bee is not conscious of wrongdoing in appropriating honey from clover which

belongs to another. But as soon as the incomparable worth and sanctity of personality become clear, as soon as the meaning of social relationship and corporate life is attained, as soon as the majesty and power of love have been proved, the destructive method of war seems then to the awakened conscience inherently an evil way, not to be sanctioned or endured.

War now stands out in irreconcilable conflict with the spirit of love and with the central principle of the kingdom of God, to which the highest loyalty is due. There cannot be any occasion that warrants the suspension of the higher way, now that it has been discovered and its power revealed. Love cannot deny its own nature and sanction the way of hate and rapine. However dark the hour, however extreme the crisis, love must continue to hope all things, to believe all things, and, if necessary, to endure all things. It is, nevertheless, no soft and acquiescent attitude. It does not surrender, with free hand, the reins to the capricious will of evil men. There is always a majesty attaching to determined moral goodness. Love, in this wide and deep social and corporate meaning, is power and not weakness. It will flame forth in moral indignation when injustice threatens. It will register its voice and vote for righteousness with no uncertain sound. It can speak and act with a force quite as effective as that of guns. It is possible to be militant and yet to be a member of the kingdom. It is not inconsistent with the spirit of love in behalf of truth and goodness to use the mightiest weapons there are—so long as they are weapons adapted to the constructive purposes of love.

In a world diverse as ours is, there will naturally be at any one stage of history a strange mingling of the old way and the new way, of the past and the future, of exponents of force and exponents of love. The way of the kingdom is not set up by miracle. It "comes" by the slow triumph of one type of life over other types. Those who have been awakened and who see the vision are called to live in this unfinished world by laws and principles which are only partially and feebly recognized. It requires courage and it demands high faith. But the way to make laws and principles spread and grow and prevail is to acknowledge them as true, to accept them as the way of life, and to carry them as far as can be done into operation in the complex affairs of daily life. There is no clearer call, no more rational appeal, no higher loyalty, than those which rise out of the fellowship with Christ, and, cost what they may, there is no nobler venture than to obey the call, to answer the appeal, to live by this loyalty.

AS TO NATIONAL INTERESTS

By JACKSON H. RALSTON

IN A PRECEDING article in the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* I pointed out that one of the great secrets of modern conflicts was to be found in the fact that for very selfish purposes nations sought jurisdiction over natural resources and, having obtained it, set up as against their neighbors tariff walls and other interferences with trade, and sought to obtain for their private owners selfish advantages; that, to further these advantages, they indulged in incipient warfare, and that,

unless this system were treated with the frankness and honesty it deserved, armed wars were, under present conditions, natural. Only even and exact justice could prevent war. I further indicated that conflicts between great financial interests provoked wars, as illustrated by occurrences in Morocco, Mesopotamia, Central Africa, and elsewhere. In this respect none of the great European nations could hold itself guiltless with regard to the recent World War.

A study of the Litkowsky memoirs shows that, in his opinion at least, war between England and Germany would have been unthinkable if their respective banking and other business interests had been satisfied in Africa and Mesopotamia.

It becomes an interesting study to learn exactly what so-called national interests mean, and why and how they may be used to bring about conflicts between nations. A thorough diagnosis of the situation and its fearless treatment would go far toward inaugurating correction of present conditions.

It is said that European nations have, or have had, spheres of influence in China, Africa, and elsewhere, and that within those spheres of influence their national interests were entitled to full play at the expense of other nations. Japan, we are informed, has special interests in China (the Lansing-Ishii notes erroneously declared them to exist) and Spain and France are now claiming them in Morocco.

Can a nation, in point of fact, have any interest in a country over which it does not possess perfect and complete sovereignty? I should deny it. The purpose for which government is formed is not to have, as a government, interests in other countries. It is formed for the preservation of order and the regulation of internal affairs within its own circumscribed limits and for protection against invasion. It does not control the railroads, banks, ore beds, or commerce of another country, and ordinarily its scope of operations in these respects is very limited, even within its own proper bounds. It may happen that a large number of persons of Japanese, English, or other origin may own and manage railroads, mining property, and banks, and carry on commerce in China or elsewhere; but the things which they own are private, or so treated, and individually possessed by them because of the good grace of the country in which they happen to operate. Their possession becomes a source of profit to the owner, the only governmental interest of whose country is through the small measure in which such owners become contributors to its taxes.

The so-called British or Japanese interests in China rest in the keeping of a few hundred or a few thousand individuals. The great mass of millions of other citizens derive no profit or benefit therefrom. It may not, therefore, be said in any true sense of the term, that there are British interests or Japanese interests in China or American interests in Mexico. To speak of the interest of an American citizen as if it were the same as an American interest or, in other words, an interest of America, has but the shadow of truth and none of its substance. We shall not be free from the danger of war until this fact is thoroughly understood. We should not allow ourselves to be deceived. We must not treat the hand of Esau and the voice of Jacob as if they belonged properly together.

There is but one interest which may by any possibility be called governmental (in truth it is not a governmental, but a world interest), and that is that, commercially, all foreigners within a country should be treated upon a basis of equality and not of preference. This was all that was involved in the so-called open-door policy of the late Secretary Hay. To go to war, however, to establish an open-door policy would simply mean the infliction of misery upon thousands for the benefit of the handful who would be the principal gainers therefrom. The evil would always be certain; the good problematical and doubtful, and at best out of all proportion compared with the absolute disaster.

But if I am right, and I do not think the positions so far taken can be successfully controverted, why is it that pseudo-national interests are so often at the bottom of ill feeling between countries and, as in the latest world tragedy, the underlying cause of active war? The short answer some might find by recalling the remark of Carlyle 100 years ago, to the effect that England was inhabited by 20 millions of people, mostly fools. The people of all countries are deluded by a word. A few of their number desire special advantages in designated countries, and, forgetting their poverty and real non-interest, the majority believe that they may share in the profit which goes only to the few.

I have heard, as who has not, the campaign orator describing to a credulous audience the tremendous advance in popular prosperity which had occurred under the then control of his party. Billions have been spoken of as if the speaker and his hearers really understood and comprehended the word in its full sense. Millions seemed to be dancing in the air, as the audience subjected itself to the hypnotic influence of the orator. The illusion of great wealth took possession of the hearers. And yet, when the voice of the orator was stilled, the band had ceased to play, and the lights were turned out, the poor listeners went to their homes to struggle with the same poverty they had always experienced. The billions were somewhere, but not with them.

In like manner nations are befooled by the limited number who hope to gain through the possession of foreign wealth. Insistently the people are told, and in a state of hypnosis they believe, that in some mysterious manner the dancing ignis fatuus of foreign fortune is to be converted to their individual use. Thus it was that the French common people were persuaded to give up their lives and fortunes in conquering Madagascar and Tonquin, and the Italian peasantry believed that they were to grow great and wealthy through the control of Tripoli by their government. Even in our own country, when the taking of the Philippine Islands was under consideration, anxious official inquiry was made as to their potentiality of wealth, to the end of satisfying the American people when about to enter upon an experiment which many of them regarded as doubtful.

Perhaps, after all, this idea is only a survival, as the coccyx and the vermiform appendage are supposed to be. When a tribe or a nation moved of old from an inclement or worn-out land and seized a mild and fertile country, killing the old inhabitants, each warrior taking up some of the unoccupied lands, each individual was the gainer from warfare. It was in some such fashion as this that we disposed of the Indian. But

now the vast body of the so-called civilized nations lose by war. All the advantages they possibly could obtain from war (and none of its losses) are to be had by breaking down the artificial man-made barriers that separate countries. We have now lost the advantage to all the victors which once came from the impartial slaughter of the losers and possession of their lands.

Thus looked at, and in sober common sense, other views must be rejected, war becomes usually an utterly sordid operation, and the people who fight in it simply the cat's-paws of those who are colder-blooded and less idealistic than the majority.

After all, ideals are created and played upon, else men would not so readily surrender their lives and impoverish their future to benefit others. The people are persuaded to be for their country, right or wrong. Unconsciously they worship a fetish. In the older time the king, the people were told, could do no wrong. In this more modern day, when we are for our country under any and all circumstances, forgetting that, if wrong, real patriotism compels us to make it right, we are making a fetish but little changed from the ancient form. We now declare that the people may not err. In point of fact it is possible the people may do wrong themselves. The chance of evil conduct is infinitely multiplied because of the docility with which they accept the teachings of those who are influenced in these matters by purely selfish motives. The people believe they are themselves acting, when in fact they are being played upon. Their ambition, their avarice, their chauvinistic patriotism, their pride of supremacy, are the keys. They have no more to do with the tune that is played than has the piano.

To all this, democratic government is no answer. A republic, in but little less degree than a monarchy, can be moved by artificial passion. The answer must come in a wider general intelligence, which will ever penetrate behind conduct to motive.

THE TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

Amid the acclaim and thanksgiving of the world, the British and Irish delegates came finally to a conclusion for peace in Ireland, and formulated a compact under which Ireland would be given the dominion status enjoyed by Canada and other great self-governing units in the British Empire, or, as it now is called by the English, the British Commonwealth of Nations.

As the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* goes to press, the compact is certain of the overwhelming approval of the British Parliament and seems likely to be given the approval of Dail Eireann, the Sinn Fein Parliament. However, in the latter body Eamonn de Valera has been making a hard fight for rejection, on the ground that Ireland should have absolute independence. He is opposed by Arthur Griffith, the organizer of Sinn Fein; by Michael Collins, commander of the Irish Republican army, and by other representative Sinn Feiners.

The text of the treaty follows:

ARTICLE I

Ireland shall have the same constitutional status in the

community of nations known as the British Empire as the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa. with a Parliament having powers to make laws for peace and order and good government in Ireland, and an executive responsible to that Parliament, and shall be styled and known as the Irish Free State.

ARTICLE II

Subject to provisions hereinafter set out, the position of the Irish Free State in relation to the Imperial Parliament, the government, and otherwise shall be that of the Dominion of Canada, and the law, practice, and constitutional usage governing the relationship of the Crown or representative of the Crown and the Imperial Parliament to the Dominion of Canada shall govern their relationship to the Irish Free State.

ARTICLE III

A representative of the Crown in Ireland shall be appointed in like manner as the Governor-General of Canada and in accordance with the practice observed in making such appointments.

ARTICLE IV

The oath to be taken by the members of the Parliament of the Irish Free State shall be in the following form:

I do solemnly swear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of the Irish Free State as by law established, and that I will be faithful to His Majesty King George V and his heirs and successors by law, in virtue of the common citizenship of Ireland with Great Britain and her adherence to and membership of the group of nations forming the British commonwealth of nations.

ARTICLE V

The Irish Free State shall assume liability for service of the public debt of the United Kingdom as existing at the date thereof and toward the payment of war pensions as existing on that date in such proportions as may be fair and equitable, having regard for any just claims in behalf of Ireland by way of set-off or counter-claims, the amount of such sums being determined, in default of agreement, by the arbitration of one or more independent persons, being citizens of the British Empire.

ARTICLE VI

Until an arrangement has been made between the British and Irish governments whereby the Irish Free State undertakes her own coastal defense, defense by sea of Great Britain and Ireland shall be undertaken by His Majesty's imperial forces, but this shall not prevent the construction or maintenance by the Government of the Irish Free State of such vessels as are necessary for the protection of the revenue or the fisheries. The foregoing provisions of this article shall be reviewed at a conference of representatives of the British and Irish governments to be held at the expiration of five years from the date hereof, with a view to the undertaking by Ireland of a share in her own coastal defense.

ARTICLE VII

The Government of the Irish Free State shall afford to His Majesty's Imperial force (a) in time of peace such harbor and other facilities as are indicated in the annex hereto, or such other facilities as may from time to time be agreed between the British Government and the Government of the Irish Free State, and (b) in time of war or of strained relations with a foreign power such harbor and other facilities as the British Government may require for the purposes of such defense, as aforesaid.

ARTICLE VIII

With a view to securing observance of the principle of international limitation of armament, if the Government of